

Serial Number: 09/735,025

Docket Number: 10002627-1

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1-22, 24-27, 29-32 and 34-36 remain pending in the present patent application. Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 27, and 32 have been amended, and claims 23, 28, and 33 have been canceled. Applicant requests reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

In item 1 of the Office Action, the drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR §1.83(a) as items in the specification failed to match those noted in the drawings. Specifically, in FIG. 1, the operating system is noted by reference number 186 and the browser is noted by reference number 189, whereas such items are noted with different reference numbers in the specification. Upon closer scrutiny, it was discovered that an inadvertent error was made in number such items in the specification and not the drawings. This reflects that the number 183 was inadvertently used for two different items in the specification, namely, the printer interface and the operating system. In fact, the numbering in the drawings is correct, and the numbers in the specification are in error. Accordingly, the specification has been amended above so that the references numbers match up with the drawings. In view of this amendment, Applicants request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

In item 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-22, 25-27, 30-32, and 35-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application 2001/0052910 A1 filed by Parekh et al. (hereafter "Parekh"). Anticipation under §102 "requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under construction. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). For the reasons that follow, Applicant asserts that independent claims 1, 8, 15, 27, and 32 as amended and claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-21, 25-26, 30-31, and 35-36 that depend from claims 1, 8, 15, 27, and 32, respectively, include elements not shown or suggested by Parekh. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-22, 25-27, 30-32, and 35-36 be withdrawn.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the following:

1. A system for generating a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:
 - a processor circuit having a processor and a memory;
 - GUI generation logic stored on the memory and
 - executable by the processor, the GUI generation logic comprising:
 - logic to generate an input field in the graphical
 - user interface, the input field being associated with an input item

Serial Number: 09/735,025

Docket Number: 10002627-1

in a template, the template expressing a content of a digital document in a markup language file; and
logic to automatically label the input field in the graphical user interface with a content of an input field tag in the template, the input field tag being associated with the input item in the template.

Claims 8 and 15 have also been amended to recite subject matter similar in scope with claim 1 above. With respect to claims 1 and 8, the Office Action states: "Parekh also discloses an input field label in the graphical user interface from and input field tag in the template, the input field tag being associated with the input item in the template". (Office Action, page 3, lines 5-7).

As amended, claims 1 and 8 further define the template as expressing a content of a digital document in a markup language. Also, the template includes logic to automatically label an input field generated for an input item in the template with the content of an input field tag in the template. In this respect, the input fields and labels associated therewith in a graphical user interface are generated dynamically directly from the document expressed by the template. Thus, rather than creating predefined graphical user interface templates to facilitate obtaining input information to fill in various input items in the document expressed by the template, a graphical user interface is generated directly from the template itself using the content of the tags to label input fields.

Parekh describes the use of "templates" to generate display screens using a "screen template generator". In fact, for each display screen, three "template files" are employed including a "canonical template file", "a screen definition file", and a "device template file". (See paragraph 0014). These files are specifically created to generate a respective display screen therefrom. However, Parekh does not show or suggest the use of the content of tags in a template file to label an input field. Rather, these files specify all of the respective details of display screens in a traditional manner. Consequently, in order to generate a new display screen, these files need to be created.

In contrast, rather than creating predefined display screens, the present invention describes an approach where input GUIs are generated directly from documents expressed in a markup language. Thus, a user may generate configurable documents that a user can personalize for their printing needs without

Serial Number: 09/735,025

Docket Number: 10002627-1

also creating separate predefined display screens to facilitate inputting the user specific information.

As a consequence, Applicants assert that Parekh fails to show or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 8. In addition, Parekh fails to show or suggest all of the elements of claim 15 that includes elements similar in nature to claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1, 8, and 15 as amended, and claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 as depending from claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively, be withdrawn.

In addition, claim 22 has been amended to recite the following:

22. A system for generating a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:
a processor circuit having a processor and a memory;
GUI generation logic stored in the memory and
executable by the processor, the GUI generation logic comprising:
logic to identify an input item with a default value in
a template, the template representing a document in a markup
language file; and
logic to generate the graphical user interface from
the template that displays the document as the document
appears when printed with an input field included within the
document, the input field being associated with the input item,
and the default value being initially displayed in the input item.

Claim 22 recites logic that generates a display of a document expressed in the template as the document would appear when printed with an input field included within the document. In this respect, the document is displayed in a "what-you-see-is-what-you-get" format. This input field is associated with an input item in the document that can be filled with user specific information to generate a complete document for printing. Also, a default value is initially displayed in the input item that a user may write over with user specific information. As a consequence, the user interface as described in claim 22 can be generated directly from a document template that is applied to a page layout engine to generate a digital version of the document to be printed.

Parekh fails to show or suggest generating a display as claimed in claim 22. Rather, Parekh discusses generating "template files" as described above. Nowhere in Parekh is it shown or suggested to display the document with input fields as claimed in claim 22. In addition, claims 27 and 32 include elements similar in scope to the elements of claim 22. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of

Serial Number: 09/735,025

Docket Number: 10002627-1

claims 22, 27, and 32, and claims 25-26, 30-31, and 35-36 as depending from claims 22, 27, and 32, respectively, be withdrawn.

In addition, in item 3 of the Office Action, claims 23-24, 28-29, and 33-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Parekh. Applicant notes that claims 23, 28, and 33 have been canceled herein, thereby rendering this grounds of rejection moot with respect to such claims. Claims 24, 29, and 34 depend from claims 22, 27, and 32, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants assert that Parekh fails to show or suggest all of the elements of claims 24, 29, and 34 for the same reasons as discussed above with reference to claims 22, 27, and 32. Consequently, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 24, 29, and 34 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicants' response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel.

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 22 2003

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. D'Aurelio
Reg. No. 40,977

OFFICIAL

D'Aurelio & Mathews, LLC
96 Church Street
Chagrin Falls, Ohio 44022
Phone: (440) 729-7450
Fax: (440) 729-7465